

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
April 22, 2009

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White
Michael Krueger
Robert McFarland
Kathy Moehring
Eric Schatmeier

Members Absent:

Jane Lee
Srikant Subramaniam

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer
Barry Bergman, Transportation Coordinator

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a. March 25, 2009

Chair Knox White noted that on page 6, the minutes read, “I did not know where the 170% increase in rider ship came from.” He noted that he actually did know where the 170% increase came from, that that was made very clear. He did not understand why they were using a 200% increase after explaining their methodology.

He then asked for a clarification as well regarding his comment before the motion on page 8. He suggested that the water shuttle be the primary area to be studied and recommended the City Council to direct staff to begin the planning process. He recalled that that comment was part of the motion but did not see it noted in the motion. He asked that the tape be reviewed. He inquired if anyone had any comments and clarified that this was on the bike bridge. His thoughts were that the water shuttle should be the primary area.

Commissioner Krueger seemed to recall that it was part of the motion.

Staff Khan concurred and stated he would review the tape.

Commissioner Krueger moved approval of the minutes for the March 25, 2009 meeting and minutes as amended. *Commissioner Moehring* seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. (Abstain: *Commissioner McFarland*. Absent: *Commissioner Lee*, *Commissioner Subramaniam*).

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

None.

4. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Knox White asked about activities of the Transit Plan Subcommittee .

Commissioner Krueger indicated that he had started to review the work scope for Transit Plan. *Commissioner Krueger* stated that *Commissioner Schatmeier* and he will have their comments to staff by April 29 in order to schedule another subcommittee meeting.

Chair Knox White stated that at the ILC meeting today there was talk about looking at the Long Range Transit Plan update. Both the City and AC Transit expressed strong interest in this activity especially in regards to Alameda Point and its development.

Commissioner Schatmeier indicated that he had not heard about the ILC meeting and asked how he could be informed of upcoming meeting.

Staff Bergman assured *Commissioner Schatmeier* that he would sign up all Commission members to the TMP email list and this would assure notification of upcoming meetings.

Chair Knox White requested that staff provide an update at the end of the meeting on the ILC meeting under Staff Communications.

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS

There were none.

6. OLD BUSINESS

6A. Development of Multimodal Thresholds of Significance and Methods for Resolving Conflicts on Street Segments with Multiple Modal Preferences

Chair Knox White asked if someone from Dowling Associates would be present tonight.

Staff Khan replied that there was a miscommunication on their part and that they would not be present as they were in Washington, DC.

Staff Bergman presented the staff report. He stated that this was a very complex topic and a challenge to write a report for people who were not immersed in this subject matter. He apologized for any confusion and appreciated any questions if clarification was needed. The reason for this report was to see how the City would address its anticipated growth. Because certain projects have been approved and others are on the horizon, growth will happen in Alameda. The thresholds of significance will help guide the City on how to make decisions. For the traffic analysis, future projects are taken into consideration such as those at Alameda Point (Measure A compliant alternative). The challenge was finding the balance between accepting severe impacts to the transportation system because of growth versus being too strict, so that small impacts could preclude growth.

In response to the Commission's request from the March meeting, *Staff Bergman* discussed the methods used to calculate the level of service (LOS) for each mode. He noted that the bicycle LOS was easiest to illustrate as they describe the physical conditions for bicyclists. The others primarily measure delay or travel time.

Santa Clara Avenue was used as an example; for the entire corridor, from west of Webster Street to Broadway it had a bicycle LOS D (3.65). Variables in the LOS calculation included the amount of space, presence of a bike lane, traffic volume, vehicle speed, pavement conditions and truck traffic. He described the conditions on different sections of the corridor:

- Webster Street to Grand Street - bike lane; the LOS score has improved to 2.4, LOS B, due to the bike lane and more space for the bicyclist.
- East of Grand Street, between Grand Street and Oak Street - 3.32, LOS C, the LOS degraded because there is no bike lane.
- East of Oak Street between Oak Street and Park Street - 3.83, the LOS further increased because the street narrows.
- East of Park Street, between Park Street and Broadway - 4.01. The travel lanes are narrower, and there is no bike lane.

Chair Knox White asked about vehicle volumes.

Staff Bergman stated that for bicycle LOS, vehicle volumes did not have as much of an impact as the lack of space.

Chair Knox White stated that the bicycle LOS did not take into account off road paths.

Staff Bergman agreed that this was only for on-street environments.

Chair Knox White asked if the bicycle route on Oak Street would impact the LOS score.

Staff Bergman replied that it would be counted in only if, for example, vehicle speeds were slowed. He also pointed out also that intersections with turn pockets could affect the results within a segment. If that were to be done, the portion of the segment with the turn pocket would be evaluated separately.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked if bicycle usage had anything to do with this.

Staff Bergman replied that it did not. The model is based on the user perception and comfort.

Commissioner Schatmeier asked if the bicycle LOS was relevant if the formula does not account for demand.

Staff Bergman commented that if the conditions were good, it could attract more riders.

Staff Bergman discussed how the thresholds were analyzed. Two different alternatives for resolving conflicts between preferred modes: looking for auto mode of LOS D as threshold of significance, although intersection LOS F would be acceptable if LOS D could be maintained along the segment. Regarding transit, staff proposed the recommendation from the staff report following discussions with AC Transit. Staff report said LOS D would be a threshold for a segment, but that the segment would be allowed to degrade below LOS D if LOS C could be maintained for the route across the entire City. Staff revised this to recommend a threshold of LOS C for the segment; if the corridor is already below LOS C, then the impact would be significant if the transit's vehicle average speed decreased by 10% or more. A corridor is defined by the impacted bus stop and taking two bus stops further ahead and behind, a total of

five stops, within the city boundaries. Transit needs to be emphasized as the primary mode, dealing with long distance trips, as this is the best opportunity to substitute for vehicle trips.

Staff Khan clarified that the change was made after talking with AC Transit and the City Attorney's office. AC Transit expressed concerns about the impact LOS D would have on their service. The City Attorney was concerned that if the City asked a developer or a project applicant to improve a corridor to LOS C, above the threshold of LOS D, that may not be legally viable. The City Attorney asked that the threshold be raised for transit higher than other modes, making it LOS C, to avoid this conflict. AC Transit was pleased with this change as well.

Chair Knox White inquired if the impacted transit stop would have to be within the project. He asked how it would be decided if a bus stop was impacted.

Staff Khan replied that the location would be based on the trips coming out of the development.

Chair Knox White asked for clarification on how the determination of a corridor was made. How is it different than looking at the route?

Staff Khan replied that according to AC Transit, 3/4 mile to one mile makes up a corridor, which is approximately five bus stops.

Chair Knox White stated that Alameda Towne Centre wanted to expand and one of the traffic impacts is at Central Avenue and Eighth Street. He noted that two stops from Alameda Towne Centre would bring you to Willow Street and Otis Drive. He asked if under this threshold, would it be possible to fix the impact at Central Avenue and Eighth Street?

Staff Khan replied it would be addressed only if the transit corridor was impacted in the resolution of conflicts. If not, impacts could not be mitigated at Central Avenue and Eighth Street.

Chair Knox White inquired if the way mitigations were being done for autos at intersections is illegal and questionable. He noted that impacts to auto intersection LOS is considered throughout the City; but whenever discussion is about bicycles, transit, or pedestrians, that impact has to be on the property or next to it or we're too far away to have a nexus.

Staff Khan clarified that the City Attorney's office stated the nexus needed to be shown and explained as how far the corridor really was. If five stops were not the right length of the corridor, the corridor would be extended.

Chair Knox White agreed.

Staff Bergman continued explaining Alternative 1 for the pedestrian mode. The threshold would be LOS D; if the location of the intersection were below that threshold, impacts would be considered significant if there is a 10% increase in delay. For bicycle LOS, the recommended threshold is LOS D and if the segment were already below that threshold, a 3% increase in the score would be significant.

Alternative 2 was discussed for the auto mode. The initial proposal was for a threshold of LOS D; for intersections below D, increase in vehicle to capacity ratio of 3%. It was noted, that at the

last Commission meeting, that this would be put on hold pending further discussion of the relationship of intersection to segment analysis.

Staff Khan stated there was a question at the last meeting as to why intersection LOS for autos be maintained and having urban street LOS also be provided. Dowling & Associates' response was when looking at intersections it was very critical to have an understanding of what was happening at the intersections in terms of turning movements. When the urban street LOS was calculated, it only looked at autos going straight. When intersection LOS is considered, left turns had to be reduced significantly to provide more time for pedestrians to cross, this caused the queues spilling out from the left turn pockets that were impacting the through movement. The Police and Fire departments indicated their concern about the impacts to emergency response times. He wanted to clarify that by having this intersection level of service allowed us understanding not just about autos, but pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements.

Staff Khan explained control delay. The operational aspect of the delay is not translated into the model. The model could track how long it took a car to go through an intersection and wait at the signal. But the spill over effect would not show up in the urban street LOS. That would be critical for autos and transit.

Commissioner Krueger inquired if the model allowed for spillover traffic. He asked if riders may take alternate routes or if the model is preprogrammed to take certain streets.

Staff Khan replied that it depends. If using SimTraffic, a micro-simulation model, the queues are simulated along with the spill over effect and if you have coded all the streets in the area it will show that there is a spillover effect and some traffic may get diverted. It all depends on how much information is put into the model.

Staff Bergman finished up with Alternative 2; transit threshold. Stated that the *Commission* had asked for additional feedback from AC Transit; that was presented. Regarding pedestrian LOS for both modes, the *Commission* had asked that it be set at B.

In Dowling & Associates' analysis, there were ten corridors and 14 intersections; bicycle and transit mode used segment as the unit of analysis; pedestrians and autos looked at intersections and compared the 2007 data to the anticipated 2030 conditions; determined which modes had the most significant impacts; identified some mitigations; looked at the impacts of implementing mitigations on other modes.

Question about pedestrian LOS B at intersections was raised at last meeting. This was tested at a few intersections; relatively few intersections in the City where there are significant problems; Dowling tried to achieve LOS B for pedestrians at intersections of Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway/Atlantic Avenue with Webster Street and the intersection of Atlantic Avenue at Constitution Way. It was found that LOS B for pedestrians was not feasible at these locations because of the queues being so long that the model could not analyze them.

Chair Knox White stated that it was never the Commission's intention to suggest that locations currently at LOS C or D would be brought up to B.

Chair Knox White stated that the Commission had asked for the study to be done with the LOS B. He stated that their intent was to say that if an intersection is already at D, the threshold

would be a 10% reduction in the wait time; they were not suggesting taking it back to a level it was decades ago.

Staff Khan stated staff's understanding that the Commission had asked to see what happens if the intersection was brought to LOS B.

Commissioner Krueger referred to page 24 under mitigation 3.6, stating that mitigations 3.1 to 3.6 suggested that pedestrian LOS D was more feasible to maintain at all intersections.

Chair Knox White noted the report stated LOS D for pedestrians would prevent mitigations. Seemed that the City's goals were to have something so low that we would never have to mitigate it; D was the way to go.

Staff Khan referred *Chair Knox White* to Mitigation 4.4.

Chair Knox White responded that if D was chosen, there would be no problems for pedestrians.

Staff Khan agreed.

Staff Bergman mentioned the Commission's comments from the last meeting, that the removal of marked crosswalks should be considered to be a significant impact. Staff agreed and supports that the inclusion of that in the thresholds.

Chair Knox White asked *Nathan Landau* from AC Transit if the recommendation suited the LOS AC Transit wanted.

Mr. Landau replied AC Transit asked to try and maintain LOS C to maintain a reasonable speed, and define a segment by the five bus stops. Stated that the off-site impact was worth addressing, looking at a place where there is an auto impact and 10% degradation in speed. Ideally, the threshold would be a 10% reduction in speed even if it were operating at LOS B.

Chair Knox White referred to the report stating the need to keep average speed up along the routes. The Dowling study mentioned corridor #10, Robert Davy Jr. Drive had a LOS B, as well as Island Drive; ¾ of the analysis was LOS B. Inquired if a decrease in travel speed from 23 mph to 13 mph before it was considered an impact would be acceptable to AC Transit.

Mr. Landau recommended previously that any transit average travel speed over the effected segment would be reduced by 10% or more. That was recommended to staff irrespective of the existing level of service; he noted that Line 51 is currently not doing better than C.

Chair Knox White inquired if AC Transit would ever have its own policy on this matter.

Mr. Landau replied possibly; planning on revising their guidelines within the next 18-24 months.

Chair Knox White inquired if in two years we may end up with a 10% degradation.

Mr. Landau replied that the average travel speed had dropped system wide to 11 mph, so it costs more to operate same service; also passengers don't want slow buses. AC Transit is working on bus rapid transit, queue jumps, signal timing to protect travel times.

Commissioner Krueger questioned segment LOS vs. intersection LOS in the summary on pg. 26 of the Dowling report.

Staff Khan indicated that Dowling stated that it is not wise to bring all intersections to F or E. If all were F, maintaining a LOS of D for the urban streets would not be possible. If some intersections were below LOS D, others would likely have to be above D to maintain LOS D for the corridor.

Commissioner Krueger stated he thought this was used to argue against the idea of using the urban street criteria as was proposed in Alternative 2.

Staff Khan clarified that Alternative 2 was not an urban street LOS it's the vehicle-to-capacity (v/c) ratio, a completely different analysis.

Chair Knox White stated he had three comments on transit. He stated that the nexus boundaries for each mode should be consistent for auto traffic, pedestrians, transit and bikes.

Commissioner Krueger stated that if the City Attorney felt the distance from the project is too great, the radius should shrink for all modes.

Staff Khan stated this had not been discussed with the City Attorney.

Commissioners Moehring and Krueger both agreed on consistency across modes.

Staff Khan stated that going into Oakland to implement mitigation for a project would be difficult, since Oakland has its own thresholds of significance.

Chair Knox White mentioned this was a corridor; should look at impact. He stated that the mitigation could be done anywhere along the line as long as the time is made up.

Staff Khan stated that depended. If the intersection was in Oakland and the segment goes below a D, it would be implemented; if impact were great in Oakland, it would be difficult to implement anything on the other side. The second concern - what goes on inside the tube or on the bridges and how to address it? He stated that in the model an artificial signal could be created to account for the delay that is caused inside the tube.

Chair Knox White commented on Alameda Point's EIR; traffic thru the tube; creating a fake is not realistic for mitigation purposes.

Commissioner Krueger inquired if mitigation outside the city limits was ever asked for.

Staff Khan replied in the affirmative; the developer pays the other city for this.

Commissioner Krueger stated he wasn't aware of that. Commented that was not right; if mitigations were done outside the city for one mode, should be the same for all modes.

Staff Khan stated this could be discussed with the City Attorney's office.

Chair Knox White reiterated *Mr. Landau's* comments regarding the 10% reduction, no matter what the LOS said.

Commissioner Krueger stated transit had fixed routes; made sense to have that 10% degradation standard for transit; automobile drivers have a choice of multiple routes.

Staff Khan stated staff had raised the bar for transit to LOS C. Alameda will be growing; if travel speeds are not allowed to drop by 10%, you cannot have growth in the city.

Commissioner Krueger asked if the objection was to any differential standard or to the 10%.

Staff Khan stated that in the future, many of the corridors will be going from C to D or E, so staff wanted to address this for the future so that it won't go to something too bad; if this was locked in at 10% in 2030, all corridors will fail.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that if the LOS for automobiles deteriorated, the demand would be higher. With transit, it would mean that speeds have gone lower and demand would go with it; want more people using transit and fewer people using automobiles.

Staff Khan agreed with *Commissioner Schatmeier*; city is keeping the transit above everything; balancing of all different modes.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated it would be ideal if growth occurred and was absorbed by the mode that could handle it the best. Transit has the capacity to handle it; if people are diverted to autos, the LOS will decline.

Staff Khan discussed significant impact. Example was given: If a bus was traveling at 13 mph on Webster Street, and a project comes along and reduces that speed to 1.3 mph from 13 mph that would be a significant impact.

Chair Knox White stated that example was not a good one; it's also an impact because of going from C to D.

Staff Khan noted that staff was proposing a range of speed between LOS C to LOS D. LOS C is between 13 mph to 19 mph; lights are running at LOS C; trying to maintain it and looking ahead to 2030 - if nothing is done, many of those lights will be going to E or F; want to give transit the highest priority; autos will be given the lowest priority, that is why some intersections will be LOS F.

Chair Knox White noted differences in two approaches. 1) buses traveling 25mph could go down to 13 mph and the developer or development would have to do nothing to fix that issue- level C. The 10% says that at 23 mph it loses 2.3, the developer would need to do something to bring it back up so it doesn't lose. 2) The development looks at what it is currently and what it would be in 2030. Transit is going to slow down just because of background growth and whatever else.

Staff Bergman asked *Mr. Landau* about travel speed measurements; how much variability is there between measurements and can this be reliably detected.

Mr. Landau replied a standard would have to be established; either p.m. or a.m. peak times; bus

speeds vs. cars or bikes; need to stop for passengers. Noted Dowling's passenger counts were not the same as AC Transit's; will not accept a future where speeds go down.

Staff Bergman spoke about the degradation of transit and the increase of transit time; real differential is between transit and motor vehicles as far as attracting riders.

Commissioner Krueger referred to mitigation 4.1 on page 21, for autos and pedestrians; reducing the transit LOS. He inquired if transit signal priority was considered.

Staff Khan answered in the affirmative; but not considered in this mitigation.

Commissioner Krueger acknowledged. Discussed growth vs. no growth; what mitigations would do or not do; no impact, no mitigation.

Staff Khan agreed that mitigations can fix anything but they are very expensive.

Chair Knox White noted the Commission had made a recommendation at the last meeting regarding LOS and that staff had responded. Need to address those comments and make a decision on transit LOS tonight. For autos, the question is should intersections or just corridors be included. For bikes and pedestrians, if LOS is set at D, there would be no mitigations and no impacts. The City can decide to make sure there are no impacts so the developer doesn't have to fix some of the issues that come with their development; or to maintain what we have.

Chair Knox White noted he was surprised to find that the urban street LOS didn't deal with intersection turning movements. He stated that staff made a good and valid argument for keeping the intersection LOS; any delays at the intersection will be factored into the corridor as well.

Staff Khan stated that including the intersection is important because it also gave an idea about pedestrian timing for the signal timing, which was critical.

Commissioner Krueger asked if staff was proposing using both methodologies.

Chair Knox White answered in the affirmative.

Chair Knox White requested adding in the language that says if it's below LOS B, which is what we recommended, that it would be an incremental change, a 10% reduction in the wait time, bike score, etc. that would cause the triggering of a threshold. Clarified that it would not be saying that it's at LOS D now and you have to pay to bring it back up to B. He added that the score went down 9%, nothing needed to be done; down 11%, would have to be brought up to 10%.

Commissioner Moehring asked if a new facility would need to be at least at LOS B.

Commissioner Krueger asked if 10% was the differential used for automobiles.

Chair Knox White replied auto was 3% but that was an increase in traffic volume, not delay.

Staff Khan stated that is what currently existed.

Chair Knox White made a suggestion for a motion that the nexus area be equal in size for all

modes; with transit, if auto intersection LOS outside of Alameda and Oakland was looked at that the first stop outside of Alameda be looked at as well, as a corridor that crosses the city boundary. He also suggested that the transit threshold be a 10% degradation no matter the level of service. For auto LOS, the current city threshold for intersections be used; use staff recommendations for arterial segments. Under bike/pedestrian, recommended adding that when below LOS B a finding of significance would be found when there is a 10% degradation. He stated that this proposed motion would allow for the bicycle and pedestrians modes could go down to B with no impact. Transit could be LOS A and if there were a 10% reduction in travel speed, it would be an impact.

Commissioner Krueger asked for a clarifying question on the proposed motion. Asked if the requirement for the same radius when looking at a nexus, would cover looking at a stop on the Oakland side; if the radius extends into Oakland, then that's how many stops on the Oakland side one might consider.

Chair Knox White thought there should be clarification.

Commissioner Krueger asked why limited to the first stop.

Chair Knox White stated half the corridor in Oakland did not need to be looked at.

Commissioner Krueger noted it was being done for cars.

Staff Khan stated there was a difference. He explained that a developer's trips from a development could impact an intersection in another jurisdiction. The other jurisdiction doesn't have the same thresholds and we meet their thresholds when we cross the City boundary.

Chair Knox White noted it was a corridor; would be one stop in; looking at a corridor which would be the majority of Alameda.

Staff Khan stated the need to keep it on the side of Alameda.

Chair Knox White agreed.

The Commission made the following recommendation: 1) the nexus area be equal in size for all modes; with transit, if auto intersection LOS outside of Alameda and Oakland was looked at that the first stop outside of Alameda be looked at as well. 2) The transit threshold would be a 10% degradation in travel speed, no matter the level of service. 3) For auto LOS, the current city threshold for intersections would be used, and use the staff recommendations for arterial segments; and 4) for the bicycle and pedestrian modes, when LOS is below B, a finding of significance would be found when there is a 10% degradation in the delay (for pedestrians) and the LOS score (for bicycles).

Moved to Conflict Resolution.

Staff Bergman discussed the two alternatives in terms of resolving conflicts and the recommended thresholds. Referred to the sample corridor on page 4 of the staff report; summarized the tables, looked at the segment of Ralph Appezzato Memorial Parkway and Atlantic Avenue extending from Main Street to Constitution Way; described as a regional

arterial for the entire length. The modal priorities for Main Street to Third Street, Third Street to Poggi Street, and Poggi Street to Webster Street, were discussed; exclusive transit right of way identified for that corridor and a bicycle priority. Segment of Webster Street to Constitution Way was identified as a secondary transit route. The land use classification was residential, from Main Street to Third Street, a school and recreational zone between Third Street and Poggi Street, residential from Poggi Street to Webster Street, and industrial/general commercial from Webster Street to Constitution Way.

Bicycle and transit were evaluated by segment level; segment treated as a whole. Bicycle LOS for the eastbound was D; westbound was LOS E. Transit was LOS D in the eastbound direction; and LOS C in the westbound direction. Pedestrian/auto mode at the intersections of Atlantic Avenue/Webster Street and Atlantic Avenue/Constitution Way. The only mode not projected to achieve the recommended minimum LOS D was the bicycle mode; projected at E. Ways were noted on how to make the bicycle LOS go back to D; re-striping, improving the pavement condition or eliminating a travel lane; turn pockets are problems. Ways to implement these mitigations without negatively impacting on the other modes. The vehicle LOS and the transit LOS would not be negatively impacted.

If Alternative 2 was applied, the modal priorities begin with automobiles as the first, second would be transit exclusive right of way, third bicycle and fourth pedestrian. There is a mode priority adjustment since it's a transit exclusive right of way and a bicycle priority, then that changes to transit exclusive being number one, bicycle number 2, auto 3 and pedestrian 4, and then the next adjustment is based on land use. There are multiple land uses along this corridor; analyzed each segment. For the Main Street to Third Street (residential), used transit exclusive #1, pedestrian #2, auto #3, and bicycle #4. The next segment, Third Street to Poggi Street (school/residential) used transit exclusive 1st, pedestrian 2nd, bicycle 3rd and auto 4th, so bicycle and auto have been flipped. Poggi Street to Webster Street, (residential) same priority as in the first segment; Webster Street to Constitution Street, transit exclusive, then bicycle, then auto, then pedestrian. Transit exclusive remained the highest priority; some discontinuities on some of the other modes based on the way it was analyzed; focused on maintaining the integrity of those modes throughout the corridor; critical for transit to maintain transit time throughout entire line.

Noted a concern regarding Alternative #2 and the bicycle mode; while specified as a priority for that corridor; on two of the four segments shows it became the lowest priority mode. Alternative #1 allows for adjustments to be made between modes that allow for a degradation of each of the modes in the event of competing priorities.

Staff Khan stated adjusting the threshold was a viable approach that could work; testing was done at certain corridors and intersections. If LOS B for auto/bikes was maintained at a certain location that would conflict with pedestrians at the same location and if an EIR found that there was no feasible way to mitigate that, the Council would have to approve a Statement of Overriding Considerations in accordance with CEQA. This means that the City would acknowledge that significant impacts would occur but that they were acceptable in this situation. He noted the flexibility permitted under Alternative 1 would enable the City to reduce the number of EIRs that would be required. EIRs generally cost a minimum of \$50,000. He recommended that the Commission to approve Alternative 1 that is listed in Exhibit 3.

Chair Knox White agreed but noted that the thresholds could be written to specifically say that something is not an impact.

Staff Bergman noted that he would like to add to the staff recommendation that if a segment had a Class I bikeway and had not been recommended for a future bicycle lane, the degradation of the bicycle LOS would be allowed to go to E and would not be considered a significant impact. Since the bicycle LOS does not account for off-street paths, this would allow a street with a Class I facility to degrade lower than one where bicyclists must ride in the street.

Chair Knox White agreed. Discussed Alternatives 1 and 2. He stated that it was strange that a bicycle priority street is a priority where it came in last on the analysis, and that pedestrians should be better taken care of in this process.

Commissioner Moehring thanked staff for creating a report that a non-transportation professional could read.

Chair Knox White stated that he hoped there would have been more analysis comparing the two different proposals and how they would work out; would have been good to look at Park or Webster Streets or Central as it comes down through the center of the island.

Staff Khan explained that the study was conducted this way because segments with potential concerns for pedestrians were selected.

Chair Knox White stated he did not have a problem with what was chosen.

Commissioner Krueger noted his that there was a slight difference between his understanding and what was written up. He thought that the bicycle mode was the number 3 priority for the residential land use regardless of whether it was a bike route or not. But it states that bikes were only prioritized if it was in the bike network. To address this situation where it is a residential land use and a regional arterial, he suggested slot bicycle in after pedestrian but only if it's a bike route.

Chair Knox White stated the intent was to say that bike is only prioritized here if it's on a bike network.

Commissioner Krueger stated he thought his thinking on the matter may not have been correct and would like to hear from others.

Chair Knox White stated autos being the bottom priority on a regional arterial seemed odd.

Commissioner Krueger stated the land use shifted the priorities.

Chair Knox White noted that when he developed Alternative 2 that he left the bikes off purposefully.

Commissioner Krueger stated the residential land use changed it.

Chair Knox White stated the only difference between a regional arterial and non-regional arterial would be that primary transit was not prioritized in a residential area; bikes would be before transit in that area.

Commissioner Krueger stated that residential elevates bike, whether it's a bike route or not; same

thought for school & recreation; not conditional on the street type.

Staff Khan noted that if land use changed, the modes would be segmented.

Commissioner Krueger noted that may be more of an operational issue; it was a conflict resolution; if land use changes, the conflict would be treated differently.

Staff Khan noted the models could not be broken down into very small segments; two intersections are needed to do an urban street analysis; when segments are broken into small pieces it becomes impossible to see the impact.

Commissioner Moehring asked if staff was recommending Alternative 1 because there is more room for mitigation.

Staff Khan replied that the recommendation was made because with this approach transit could be kept a priority, even in a conflict.

Commissioner Krueger stated that in both alternatives, transit maintained a priority.

Staff Khan stated the pedestrian was a local impact at an intersection; wanted to maintain transit as a constant.

Commissioner Krueger asked if that was also the case in Alternative 2.

Staff Khan replied that a primary transit route would not have the highest priority because of exclusive right of way.

Commissioner Krueger noted that the inversion of pedestrian and transit in a commercial district on a regional arterial was the crux of the issue.

Staff Bergman stated that part of the issue with Alternative 2 was the sequence in which the overlays were placed; land use is the final one; under Alternative 1, land use is considered first, the modal overlay would be done last.

<p>The Commission made the following recommendation to accept Alternative 1 for resolving conflicts. <i>Chair Knox White</i> noted the vote would be prioritizing transit over pedestrian at all times.</p>

Chair Knox White mentioned that some items were not voted on at the last meeting; 4 thresholds plus the off street path exemption, LOS E for bikes. Page 1, Exhibit 4, Alternative 2, the items not discussed were bullets 1, 3 and last 2.

Commissioner Krueger stated he liked staff's recommendation.

Staff Khan stated the edits were made; listed as Alternative 1, page 2 of 4, the last bullet.

Chair Knox White noted the removal of the third bullet in Alternative 2; did not vote on short-term construction impact and safety impact.

Chair Knox White noted the threshold of significance for Alternative 1 was taken.

Commissioner Krueger stated he didn't realize there had been a split.

Chair Knox White indicated this should have been an action item. The Commission made its recommendation, so if needed it could be brought back at the next meeting for a vote.

Chair Knox White noted there were thresholds of significance that had not been voted on yet; taking no action on those. Referred to Alternative 2, page 1, 1 bullet, last 2 bullets, and staff recommendation about including removal of crosswalks. He suggested recommending those four points.

The Commission recommended approval of the staff recommendation.
--

The Commission recommended the addition of the following to the thresholds of significance: "if a segment has a Class I facility and has not been recommended for future bike lane, the degradation of LOS to E would be not considered a significant impact".
--

Commissioner Krueger stated the presentation was very well done, especially the charts.

8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Broadway/Jackson Update

Staff Khan noted had received responses from Caltrans in terms of PSR. Noted ACTIA was about to issue an RFP for the analysis of the "horseshoe".

Chair Knox White inquired if Caltrans was allowing it to move forward.

Staff Khan noted that staff's approach was to use them to do the analysis.

Upcoming development-related traffic studies and plans

Staff Khan noted that Boatworks' Project has been slowed down.

Future meeting agenda items

Staff Khan stated casual carpool will be coming to the May meeting, including a presentation on what has been done, and a recommendation.

Chair Knox White stated hopefully the long-range transit plan update will be agendized.

Staff Khan stated it could be brought forward for discussion but not sure how it would be funded.

Staff Khan noted a final recommendation would be presented.

Staff Bergman noted the CMA was interested in brining in a draft of its Community Based Transportation Plan for input.

ILC Update

Staff Khan noted several issues were discussed; Line 51 & performance measures from AC Transit; when those are received they will be shared with the Commission; Line 63 - AC Transit

said moving to Shoreline Drive was not a viable option from their recommendation; from Otis Drive they are proposing to establish a bus stop at Sandcreek Way on Otis Drive, where it used to exist before. Councilmember Matarrese had asked that this go to City Council for their final decision. Staff will be preparing a report and taking it to council in next few weeks.

Alameda EasyPass program for full-time City employees– all the photos have been taken; passes should be received May 1st.

Discussed Santa Clara and Chestnut item regarding the request to relocate the bus stop; there was no appeal of the TC decision The bench for that location should be installed this week; shelter issue still under discussion, and the City is applying for funding for 16 shelters through the federal stimulus package.

Commissioner Krueger remembered they been prioritized by ridership.

Commissioner Krueger stated the recommendation had included trashcans as well as benches.

Staff Bergman replied he wasn't sure of the status, and he would follow up with solid waste staff.

Staff Khan discussed Suncal and AC Transit in terms of service in the city; could get funding. AC Transit cuts were discussed due to the budget crisis; there will be a public workshop in mid-May to seek input on key transit priorities from the public

Commissioner Schatmeier noted there were alternate ways of dealing with this.

Chair Knox White noted AC Transit was asked to come speak to the TC as part of its process.

Staff Bergman mentioned a memo had been received from the Alameda Youth Advisory Commission staffed by our Recreation and Parks Department; they had transportation issues; requested a copy of their memo be distributed.

Also, a letter addressed to *Chair Knox White* from Jeff Cambra, Estuary Crossing Committee for Bike Alameda; asked that this be shared with the Commission.

9. ADJOURNMENT: 10:00 p.m.